

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on October 4, 2005. Reexamination in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 8-24 are currently pending in this application, with claims 6, 8 and 12 being independent.

No new matter has been added.

Entry of amendment

This amendment *prima facie* places the case in condition for allowance. Alternatively, it places this case in better condition for appeal.

Accordingly, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Drawing objections

In response to the drawing objections, Figure 1 has been amended. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Prematureness

Applicant, seeking review of the *prematureness* of the final rejection within the Final Office Action, respectfully requests reconsideration of the finality of the Office action for the reasons set forth hereinbelow. See M.P.E.P. §706.07(c).

At least for the following reasons, if the allowance of the claims is not forthcoming at the very least and a new ground of rejection made, then a **new non-final Office Action** is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

While not conceding the propriety of this rejection and in order to advance the prosecution of the above-identified application, claim 12 has been amended.

No prior art has been cited against claim 12 and dependent claims 13-24. Accordingly, claims 12-24 are deemed to contain allowable subject matter.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,699,071 to Urakami et al. (Urakami).

If the allowance of claim 6 is not forthcoming at the very least and a new grounds of rejection made, then a **new non-final Office Action** is respectfully requested for the reasons provided hereinbelow.

Within the Amendment In Response To Non-Final Office Action filed on July 19, 2005, the features of claim 7 have been wholly incorporated into claim 6. As a result original claim 7 is now presently presented claim 6.

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

Claim 6 is drawn to an antenna unit, comprising:

a flat antenna;

matching control signal generating means for generating a matching control signal corresponding to inputted data; and

a matching circuit that is so configured that the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is made variable based on said matching control signal outputted from said matching control signal generating means, wherein:

said matching circuit comprises a connective circuit including a matching coil and a variable capacitance diode, and

the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is variably controlled by varying the inductance of said matching coil and the capacitance of said variable capacitance diode based on said matching control signal.

Claim 8 is drawn to a broadcast reception terminal apparatus, comprising:

a flat antenna;

reception means for selecting and receiving airwaves of a desired reception channel;

matching control signal generating means for generating a matching control signal corresponding to reception channel selection data supplied from said reception means; and

a matching circuit that is so configured that the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is made variable based on said matching control signal outputted from said matching control signal generating means, wherein:

said matching circuit comprises a connective circuit including a matching coil and a variable capacitance diode, and

the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is variably controlled by varying the group including the inductance of said matching coil and the capacitance of said variable capacitance diode.

Urakami arguably teaches a glass antenna system for automobile having antenna 1 (Urakami at Figure 5). Urakami arguably teaches matching circuits 21 and 32 having at least one coil 13, 21 (Urakami at Figure 5).

Urakami arguably teaches that the dynamic matching circuit comprises at least two variable reactance elements to which a DC frequency selection signal is applied through the cable from said receiver (Urakami at column 3, lines 28-32).

Urakami arguably teaches that the T-shaped dynamic matching circuit 30 has variable reactance circuits including its central capacitor 19, and varactor diodes 17 and 23 each disposed on right and left branches (Urakami at Figure 5, column 4, lines 62-65).

Urakami arguably teaches that the first variable reactance circuit of Figure 7 comprises a coupling capacitor 10 connected between the input terminal 11 and a second node 16 (Urakami at Figure 7, column 5, lines 27-30).

Nevertheless, Urakami fails to disclose, teach or suggest the resonant frequency of the antenna 1 being variably controlled by varying the INDUCTANCE of either coil 13, 21.

Instead, Urakami arguably teaches that the reactance of the variable reactance circuits is controlled by the CAPACITANCE of the VARACTOR DIODES with the common frequency control voltage supplied from the receiver 6 (Urakami at column 4, lines 65-67).

In this regard, the Office Action has failed to show that controlling the CAPACITANCE of the varactor diodes 17 and 23 would change the INDUCTANCE of the dynamic matching circuit 30 of Urakami.

The Office Action contends that Urakami teaches the matching circuit 30 as having variable reactance circuits including its central capacitor 19, and varactor diodes 17 and 23 each disposed on right and left branches, and further contends that the reactance of Urakami is

controlled by the CAPACITANCE of the varactor diodes with the common frequency control voltage supplied from the receiver (Office Action at page 4).

In response to these contentions, the claims provide that the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is variably controlled by varying the INDUCTANCE of said matching coil and the CAPACITANCE of said variable capacitance diode based on said matching control signal.

In this regard, the Office Action fails to show where within Urakami that the variability of an INDUCTANCE is to be found. In this regard, the Office Action is incomplete.

Moreover, Urakami fails to disclose, teach or suggest the resonant frequency of the antenna 1 being variably controlled by varying the INDUCTANCE of either coil 13, 21. Specifically, the coils 13, 21 are not shown to be variable.

Thus, Urakami *fails* to disclose, teach or suggest the resonant frequency of said flat antenna is variably controlled by varying the INDUCTANCE of said matching coil and the capacitance of said variable capacitance diode based on said matching control signal.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: October 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 1255-3750

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments

REPLACEMENT SHEET

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In accordance with U.S. Patent and Trademark Office practice, proposed drawing changes as REPLACEMENT SHEETS are attached, wherein Applicant proposes to amend the drawings in the above-identified application as follows:

Please amend the lower Figure 1 by including the legend -- RELATED ART --

No new matter has been added. Approval is earnestly requested.